

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/049,297	Applicant(s) WALKER ET AL.	
	Examiner John W Hayes	Art Unit 2161	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) John Hayes. (3) Dean Alderucci.
 (2) Mike Downs. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 07 January 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 98-108.

Identification of prior art discussed: Deaton et al and Valencia et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed claim limitations relating to determining a second discount based on whether the first difference between the time of the current transaction and the time of the previous purchase is less than a predetermined minimum transaction period and whether the second difference between the time of the current transaction and the time of the first discount is greater than a predetermined discount adjustment period. Examiner noted that this specific limitation, particularly the second difference is not taught in the prior art and claims with this limitation would be allowable over the cited prior art. .